



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,270	06/27/2003	Craig Nevill-Manning	0026-0150	8305
44989	7590	07/02/2008	EXAMINER	
HARRITY SNYDER, LLP 11350 Random Hills Road SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA 22030			CHANNAVAJALA, SRIRAMA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2008 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/608,270
Filing Date: June 27, 2003
Appellant(s): NEVILL-MANNING, CRAIG

Vikotor Simkovic, Reg.No. 56012
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 4/18/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 8/27/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2004/0249801	Kapur	12-2004
2005/0234709	Klavans et al.	10-2005
2004/0073541	Lindblad et al.	4-2004

6922809 Coden et al. 7-2005

6701309 Beeferman et al. 3-2004

Maurer, "How to get a site listed in Google Glossary?", internet citation, 1/30/2003, one page

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 13-14, 17, 23-26, 28, 30-31, 35-36, 39, 46-49, 52-55, 58, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kapur (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0249801) in view of Klavans et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0234709).

With respect to claim 1, Kapur teaches a system for providing definitions (fig. 8). Kapur teaches a server configured to receive a phrase to be processed (i.e., a server 160 receiving a query to be defined from a client 120 in fig. 2, section 26 on page 3, section 176 on page 17, and fig. 8) and select a document containing at least one definition for the phrase (i.e., a dictionary web page containing a definition and web

pages containing descriptive information are crawled/spidered and indexed, section 176 on page 17, fig. 8, and sections 25 and 28 on page 3). Kapur teaches a user interface configured to present one or more of the definitions for the phrase (i.e., definitions of the query are shown in fig. 8, section 176 on page 17) in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definition (i.e., ranking web pages containing definition elements, section 25 on page 3, section 176 on page 17, and fig. 8).

Kapur does not explicitly disclose definitions from a plurality of documents. However, Klavans teaches extracting at least one of the definitions from a plurality of documents (i.e., definitions from articles on the Internet, abstract, sections 3- 10 on page 1, and sections 27-29 on page 2) in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

Therefore, based on Kapur in view of Klavans, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Klavans to the system of Kapur in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

With respect to claim 2, Kapur teaches selecting a document containing at least one definition is performed prior to the receiving of the phrase (i.e., crawling/spidering and indexing web pages containing definition element information can be performed in

batch mode, section 25 on page 3). Kapur does not explicitly disclose definitions from a plurality of documents. However, Klavans teaches indexing at least one of the definitions from a plurality of documents (i.e., definitions from articles on the Internet, abstract, sections 3-10 on page 1, and sections 27-29 on page 2). Therefore, the limitations of claim 2 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 3, Kapur teaches the documents are Web pages (fig. 8, section 19 on page 2, and section 176 on page 17). Klavans also teaches the documents are Web pages (sections 3-10 on page 1, and sections 27-29 on page 2).

With respect to claim 4, Kapur teaches performing a search based on a search query that includes a predetermined term indicative of a presence of definitions (i.e., a user enters "define (argument)" as a query, section 176 on page 17 and fig. 8).

With respect to claim 6, Kapur teaches the predetermined term includes one of glossary, definition, or dictionary (i.e., "define (argument)" as a query, section 176 on page 17 and fig. 8).

With respect to claim 8, Kapur teaches the determining the presence of the phrase in a determined document (i.e., locating an indexed web page that include the

query, fig. 8 and section 176 on page 17). The limitations of claim 8 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 9, Kapur teaches the selecting includes determining the absence of the phrase in a determined document (i.e., locating indexed web pages that include the query teaches discarding indexed web pages that do not include the query, fig. 8, section 176 on page 17). The limitations of claim 9 are rejected in the analysis of claim 8 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 13, Kapur teaches retrieving an associated definition of the phrase (i.e., the query's additional definitions "b" and "c" are retrieved in fig. 8 and in case of "java" query, a definition of java as the computer language and additional definitions of java as the Indonesian Island and coffee can be retrieved, section 28 on page 3).

With respect to claim 14, Kapur teaches the documents are determined substantially in real-time in response to the phrase being received from a user (i.e., performing Internet search with the arguments, section 25 on page 3, section 176 on page 17, fig. 2, and fig. 8).

With respect to claim 17, Kapur teaches the presenting further includes

processing the definitions (i.e., retrieving and displaying a definition of the query in a format, fig. 8 and section 176 on page 17).

The limitations of claim 23 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 24 are rejected in the analysis of claim 2 above and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 25 are rejected in the analysis of claim 3 above and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 26 are rejected in the analysis of claim 4 above and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 28 are rejected in the analysis of claim 6 above and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 30 are rejected in the analysis of claim 8 above and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 31 are rejected in the analysis of claim 9 above and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 35 are rejected in the analysis of claim 13 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 36 are rejected in the analysis of claim 14 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 39 are rejected in the analysis of claim 17 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 46, Kapur teaches an apparatus for providing definitions (fig. 8). Kapur teaches means for receiving a phrase to be processed (i.e., a server 160 receiving a query to be defined from a client 120 in fig. 2, section 26 on page 3, section 176 on page 17, and fig. 8). Kapur teaches means for determining a document containing at least one definition (i.e., a dictionary web page containing a definition and web pages containing descriptive information are crawled/spidered and indexed, section 176 on page 17, fig. 8, and sections 25 and 28 on page 3). Kapur teaches means for matching the phrase to at least one of the definitions (i.e., at least one of the definitions is matched/located with the query in fig. 8, section 176 on page 17). Kapur teaches

means for presenting one or more of the definitions, determined based on a result of the means for matching, for the phrase (i.e., definitions of the query are shown in fig. 8, section 176 on page 17) in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions (i.e., ranking web pages containing definition elements, section 25 on page 3, section 176 on page 17, and fig. 8).

Kapur does not explicitly disclose definitions from a plurality of documents. However, Klavans teaches extracting at least one of the definitions from a plurality of documents (i.e., definitions from articles on the Internet, abstract, sections 3-10 on page 1, and sections 27-29 on page 2) in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

Therefore, based on Kapur in view of Klavans, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Klavans to the system of Kapur in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

With respect to claim 47, Kapur teaches a system for determining definitions from distributed information stores (i.e., crawling/spidering and indexing web pages containing definition/descriptive information from server systems, fig. 2, sections 25-26 on page 3, section 176 on page 17, and fig. 8). Kapur teaches a search engine identifying a document based on a search query including terms indicative of a

presence of definition (i.e., a search engine in a server 160 in fig. 2 crawling/spidering web pages containing definition/descriptive information and a user enters "define (argument)" as a query, section 30 on page 4, sections 4-5 on page 1, section 72 on pages 9-10, sections 25-26 on page 3, section 176 on page 17, and fig. 8), and storing information regarding each identified documents (i.e., indexing crawled/spidered web pages, section 25 on page 3). Kapur teaches a search front end matching a phrase for which a definition is sought against the stored information for each identified document (i.e., a server 160 in fig. 2 locating an indexed web page that include a query, fig. 8 and section 176 on page ! 7), returning one or more matching definitions based on the matching of the phrase, and presenting each matching definition (i.e., retrieving indexed web pages from server systems and presenting definitions of the query, fig. 8, section 176 on page 17, and sections 25-26 on page 3) in an order determined based on a ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions (i.e., ranking web pages containing definition elements, section 25 on page 3, section 176 on page 17, and fig. 8).

Kapur does not explicitly disclose definitions from a plurality of documents. However, Klavans teaches extracting at least one of the definitions from a plurality of documents (i.e., definitions from articles on the Internet, abstract, sections 3- 10 on page 1, and sections 27-29 on page 2) in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

Therefore, based on Kapur in view of Klavans, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Klavans to the system of Kapur in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

With respect to claim 48, Kapur teaches a repository storing the information for a subset of the identified documents (i.e., storage 170 in fig. 2, section 27 on page 3).

With respect to claim 49, Kapur teaches the search engine searches a structure of a document for indication of a presence of a definition (i.e., a query processing engine for processing a query, wherein the query processing engine is included in a server 160 in fig. 2 and searching for query terms that indicate a presence of a definition, section 31 on page 4, section 176 on page 17, and fig. 8).

Kapur does not explicitly disclose definitions from a plurality of documents. However, Klavans teaches extracting at least one of the definitions from a plurality of documents (i.e., definitions from articles on the Internet, abstract, sections 3-10 on page 1, and sections 27-29 on page 2). Therefore, the limitations of claim 49 are rejected in the analysis of claim 47 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 52, Kapur teaches the matching definitions comprise at least one of matching terms and phrases, related terms and phrases, or random and

eclectic terms and phrases (i.e., locating a query and its definition, in case of "java" query, a definition of java as the computer language and additional definitions of java as the Indonesian Island and coffee can be retrieved, section 28 on page 3 and fig. 8).

The limitations of claims 53 and 60 are rejected in the analysis of claim 47 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 54 are rejected in the analysis of claim 48 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 55 are rejected in the analysis of claim 49 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 58 are rejected in the analysis of claim 52 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

Claims 7 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kapur (U.S. Publication No. 200410249801) in view of Klavans et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0234709), and further in view of Maurer ("How to get a site listed in Goggle Glossary?", Internet online citation, 1/30/2003, 2 pages retrieved from <http://l.groups..qoo.qle.com/l,group/qoo.qle.public.labs.glossary/browse>

thread/thread/5371 9cl 3c14dfb7f/c78873b

1745039cc?q=glossary&rnum=3#c78873b 1745039cc on 1218105).

With respect to claim 7, Kapur and Klavans disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except the predetermined field is a title field. However, Maurer teaches the predetermined field is a title field (i.e., searching web pages containing "glossary", "definition", or similar words in the page's title, sections 13 and 15 on page 2) in order to locate a web page containing a definition. Therefore, based on Kapur in view of Klavans, and further in view of Maurer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Maurer to the system of Kapur in order to locate a web page containing a definition.

The limitations of claim 29 are rejected in the analysis of claim 7 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

Claims 10-12, 32-34, 50 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kapur (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0249801) in view of Klavans et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0234709), and further in view of Lindblad et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0073541).

With respect to claim 10, Kapur and Klavans disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except determining the presence of the phrase further includes determining an exact match of the phrase. However, Lindblad teaches determining the

presence of the phrase further includes determining an exact match of the phrase (i.e., searching for text in documents that exactly matches a given phrase, section 199 on page 9 and sections 206 and 209 on page 10) in order to retrieve document fragments that are relevant to the query phrase.

Therefore, based on Kapur in view of Klavans, and further in view of Lindblad, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Lindblad to the system of Kapur in order to retrieve document fragments that are relevant to the phrase.

With respect to claim 11, Kapur and Klavans disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except the matching comprises modifying the phrase. However, Lindblad teaches the matching comprises modifying the phrase (i.e., modifying the query to its canonical form, section 141 on page 6, sections 154 and 156 on page 7, and fig 9) in order to optimize the query phrase. Therefore, based on Kapur in view of Klavans, and further in view of Lindblad, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Lindblad to the system of Kapur in order to optimize the phrase in searching documents.

With respect to claim 12, Kapur and Klavans do not explicitly disclose modifying the phrase comprises determining a canonical form of the phrase. However, Lindblad teaches modifying the phrase comprises determining a canonical form of the phrase

(section 141 on page 6, section 154 on page 7, and fig 9). Therefore, the limitations of claim 12 are rejected in the analysis of claim 11, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 50, Kapur and Klavans disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except a parser parsing the identified documents to identify occurrences of the phrase for which a definition is sought. However, Lindblad teaches a parser parsing documents to identify occurrences of a phrase (section 42 on page 3, section 104 on page 5, section 220 on page 10, and fig. 9) in order to provide statistical information of the phrase. Therefore, based on Kapur in view of Klavans, and further in view of Lindblad, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Lindblad to the system of Kapur in order to provide statistical information of the phrase.

The limitations Of claim 32 are rejected in the analysis of claim 10 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 33 are rejected in the analysis of claim 11 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 34 are rejected in the analysis of claim 12 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 56 are rejected in the analysis of claim 50 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

Claims 18-19 and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kapur (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0249801) in view of Klavans et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0234709), and further in view of Coden et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,922,809).

With respect to claim 18, Kapur and Klavans disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except presenting a substantially most common capitalization of the phrase. However, Coden teaches presenting a substantially most common capitalization of a phrase (lines 18-26 in col. 1 and line 17 in col. 3 thru line 5 in col. 4) in order to allow a user to read the phrase more easily. Therefore, based on Kapur in view of Klavans, and further in view of Coden, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Coden to the system of Kapur in order to allow a user to read the phrase more easily.

With respect to claim 19, Kapur teaches presenting less common forms of the phrase (i.e., "quantity" phrase in lowercase in fig. 8).

The limitations of claim 40 are rejected in the analysis of claim 18 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 41 are rejected in the analysis of claim 19 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

Claims 20-22, 42-44, 51, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kapur (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0249801) in view of Klavans et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0234709), and further in view of Beeferman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,309).

With respect to claim 20, Kapur and Klavans disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except determining superstrings of the phrase present in the documents. However, Beeferman teaches determining superstrings of the phrase present in documents (lines 41-59 in col. 1) in order to improve a user's search query. Therefore, based on Kapur in view of Klavans, and further in view of Beeferman, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Beeferman to the system of Kapur in order to improve a user's search query.

With respect to claim 21, Kapur and Klavans do not explicitly disclose presenting

at least some of the determined superstrings. However, Beeferman teaches presenting at least some of the determined superstrings (i.e., suggesting and presenting superstrings of a query to a user, lines 41-59 in col. 1, lines 41-49 in col. 2, and lines 37-43 in col. 11). Therefore, the limitations of claim 21 are rejected in the analysis of claim 20 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 22, Kapur and Klavans do not explicitly disclose at least one of presented superstring is presented as one of a related phrase and a suggested query. However, Beeferman teaches at least one of presented superstring is presented as one of a related phrase and a suggested query (i.e., suggesting superstrings of a query to a user, lines 41-59 in col. 1, lines 41-49 in col. 2, and lines 37-43 in col. 11). Therefore, the limitations of claim 22 are rejected in the analysis of claim 21 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 51, Kapur and Klavans disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above. Kapur further teaches a processor processing the matching definition (i.e., a server 160 in fig. 2 locating definition, fig. 8 and section 176 on page 17). Kapur and Klavans do not explicitly disclose at least one of a filter limiting the matching definitions to substantially matching definitions and a definition module providing at least one of a superstring, common variants, and common forms of the phrase for which a definition is sought. However, Beeferman teaches at least one of a filter limiting the matching definitions to substantially matching definitions and a

definition module providing at least one of a superstring, common variants, and common forms of the phrase for which a definition is sought (i.e., suggesting superstrings of a query to a user, lines 41-59 in col. 1, lines 41-49 in col. 2, and lines 37-43 in col. 11) in order to improve a user's search query. Therefore, based on Kapur in view of Klavans, and further in view of Beeferman, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Beeferman to the system of Kapur in order to improve a user's search query.

The limitations of claim 42 are rejected in the analysis of claim 20 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 43 are rejected in the analysis of claim 21 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 44 are rejected in the analysis of claim 22 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claim 57 are rejected in the analysis of claim 51 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

(10) Response to Argument

a) At page 8, page 18, The applicants argue for claim 1, 23, that Kapur and Klavans do not disclose or suggest a user interface configured to present one or more definitions for a phrase in an order determined based on a ranking of documents that contain the presented one or more definitions.

As to the above argument [a], examiner respectfully traverses. Firstly, Kapur is directed to universal search interface, more specifically, providing number of search capabilities, interacting with variety of applications on user's system or computer [see page 1, 0002, line 4-8]. Secondly, Kapur specifically teaches definitions of the query for example "Yahoo! Reference Dictionary Definition" as shown in fig 8 corresponds to present one or more of the definitions for the phrase, thirdly, it is noted that Kapur also specifically teaches user inputting "phrase" for example "define (argument)", where argument is a text term [i.e., phrase] for which definition is sought. The system finds the "dictionary definition" to the user as detailed in page 17, 0176, line 16-30].

Further, it is noted that Kapur teaches ranking web pages [page 3, 0025, line 13-14] specifically containing definition elements [page 17, 0176] corresponds to claim limitation " in an order determined based on a ranking of documents that contain the presented one or more definitions"

Thus, Kapur teaches a user interface configured to present one or more definitions for a phrase in an order determined based on a ranking of documents that contain the presented one or more definitions.

Therefore, the applicants' argument is not persuasive.

b) At page 9-10, page 19, claim 1, 23, The applicant argues that Paragraph [0176], and Fig 8 of KAPUR do not find support in U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/460,222 (hereafter "Provisional Application"), to which KAPUR claims priority. Applicant notes that the filing date of KAPUR is April 5, 2004, which is after Applicant's filing date of June 27,2003. Thus, paragraph [0176] and Fig 8 of KAPUR are not prior art with respect to the present application and cannot be relied on in a rejection of Appellant's claim 1.

Furthermore, none of the documents supplied by KAPUR as part of the Provisional Application disclosed or suggest a user interface configured to present one or more definitions for a phrase in an order determined based on ranking of documents that contain the presented one or more definitions, as recited in claim 1. In fact, none of the documents of the Provisional Application disclose or suggest definitions of phrases.

As to the argument [b], examiner disagree with the applicant because :prior art KAPUR filed provisional Application 60/460,222 on April 4, 2003, while instant application claiming domestic priority based on provisional application filed on 5/20/2003 which is later than the prior art KAPUR. Therefore, KAPUR is qualified as "prior art" .

Further as noted in the "advisory action mailed on11/16/2007, examiner clearly explained that Kapur discloses fig. 8 as illustrating examples of web pages provided to a client system using the functionality provided by the UDB interface system and methodologies of the present invention (section 18). Support for subject matter of fig. 8

and section 176 can be found from its provisional application (No. 60/460,222), at least on page 14, section 41 (i.e., disclosing a universal dialog box (UDB) that a user may enter various parameters depending on the functionality desired, for example, the user may enter a term or phrase in order to perform a search or enter "send mail" command in order to send an email); page 15, section 42 (i.e., disclosing a label "Amazon(argument)" in a format of command/argument is entered in the UDB, such that a search for "argument" within the amazon.com website is performed); and page 2, section 7 and page 17, section 46 (i.e., appendices A, B, and C, especially the appendix C disclosing examples of utilizing the UDB, at least on page 16, paragraph 6 (i.e., taking the user to a search results page or specific page for that particular movie by entering "eval('the movie Richard saw last weekend')") in the UDB); page 15, paragraph 6 (i.e., mapping the phrase to that web page by simply typing: "phrase:S_" in the UDB for a given phrase in some article); page 26, paragraph 4 (i.e. "w:" code for searching weather information); and page 19, paragraphs 7-10 (i.e., thesaurus, dictionary, encyclopedia, spell-checking, white pages, etc. being utilized via the UDB). Therefore, the subject matter of fig. 8 and section 176 is supported by its provisional application.

c) At page 10-13, page 20-21, claim 1, claim 23, applicant argues that "In addition, neither KAPUR nor KLAVANS disclose or suggest a server configured to receive a phrase to be processed and select a plurality of documents each containing at least one definition for the phrase"

KLAVANS does not disclose or suggest a server that is configured to receive a phrase to be processed and select a plurality of documents each containing at least one definition of a phrase

The examiner respectfully traverses. In response to applicant's argument [c]that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Kapur disclosed server element 160 receiving a query to be defined from a client element 120, page 3, 0025, fig 8, page 17, 0176, further Kapur also specifically teaches user interface or universal display box where user enters query [fig 7-8, page 17, 0176, line 1-2]. It is however, noted that Kapur does not disclose definitions from a plurality of documents, although Kapur specifically suggests user can enter a query including words and phrases using universal dialog box [page 15, col 2, 0152]. On the other hand, Klavans teaches extracting at least one of the definitions from a plurality of documents [see abstract, page 1, col 1, 0008], i.e. Klavans specifically teaches definitions from text articles on the Internet, in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Klavans's generating dictionary entries with universal search interface system of Kapur because Klavans discloses user interface to access information [see fig 1], both Kapur, Klavans specifically teach information retrieval using internet [Kapur: fig 1-2; Klavans: page 2, col 1, 0027, line 10-12], further Kapur specifically suggests concept analysis of search terms i.e., to provide more meaning full results to the user [page 4, col 1, 0030, line 1-4] particularly search phrases; while Klavans teaches building dictionary database containing " term, definition" particularly improving on-line dictionaries [see Abstract, page 2, col 1, 0027-0029].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the search technique, particularly information retrieval using universal interface extracting term-definition pairs from full text articles and use as dictionary entries as taught in the Klavans [page 1, col 1, 0007], to improve the overall search system of Kapur for the predictable result of enabling standard searching, further providing a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

d) At page 12, page 22, page 31, page 37, page 45, page 53, claim 1, claim 23, claim 46, claim 47, claim 53, claim 60, applicant argues that "Furthermore, KLAVANS does not teach extracting at least one of the definitions from a plurality of documents

As to the above argument [d], examiner disagree with the applicant because, firstly, Klavans sis directed to generating dictionary entries, more specifically generating a dictionary from full text articles [see Abstract, line 1-2], secondly, Klavans specifically teaches "extracting <term,definition>" [page 1, col 1, 0008, line 5] that including complex <term,definition> [page 1, col 1, 0008, line 6] particularly pattern analysis to the sentences from full text articles database, further updating or adding to use as dictionary entries.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at to apply the search technique, particularly information retrieval using universal interface extracting term-definition pairs from full text articles and use as dictionary entries as taught in the Klavans [page 1, col 1, 0007], to improve the overall search system of Kapur for the predictable result of enabling standard searching, further providing a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

e) At page 14, page 23, claim 1, claim 23, applicant argues that "Furthermore, the Examiner has not explained how Fig 8 of KAPUR might be combined with the dictionary database of <term,definition> entries of KLAVANS to allegedly provide a user interface configured to present one or more definitions for the phrase in an order determined based on ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions. KLAVANS does not disclose or suggest any user interface for presenting the dictionary entries.

As to the above argument [e], Examiner disagrees with the applicant because firstly, Kapur teaches user interface i.e., user input into universal dialog box or UDB [page 17, 0176, line 1-2], secondly, Kapur specifically teaches "YAHOO! REFERENCE Dictionary Definition [see fig 8], while KLAVANS specifically teaches extracting term-definition pairs from text articles see abstract, page 1, col 1, 0008], i.e, Klavans specifically teaches definitions from text articles on the Internet, in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary. Kapur also specifically suggests classifying and ranking web pages particularly using search related algorithms for processing and ranking web pages [page 3, col 1, 0025, line 12-17], while Klavans also specifically teaches algorithm that not only automatically generating extraction patterns which identify <term,defintion> but also rank patterns I.e. <term,definition> [see Klavans: page 4, col 2, 0053, line 6-15]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Klavans's generating dictionary entries with universal search interface system of Kapur because Klavans discloses user interface to access information [see fig 1], both Kapur, Klavans specifically teach information retrieval using internet [Kapur: fig 1-2; Klavans: page 2, col 1, 0027, line 10-12], further Kapur specifically suggests concept analysis of search terms i.e., to provide more meaning full results to the user [page 4, col 1, 0030, line 1-4] particularly search phrases; while Klavans teaches building dictionary database containing " term, definition" particularly improving on-line dictionaries [see Abstract, page 2, col 1, 0027-0029].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the search technique, particularly information retrieval using universal interface extracting term-definition pairs from full text articles and use as dictionary entries as taught in the Klavans [page 1, col 1, 0007], to improve the overall search system of Kapur for the predictable result of enabling standard searching, further providing a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

Therefore, the applicants' argument is not persuasive.

Examiner applies above arguments to claims 2-3,8-9,13-14 and claims 24-25,30-31,35-36,39 depend from claim 1 and 23 respectively.

f) At page 15, 17, page 24, page 26, claim 4, 6, 26, 28, applicant argues that "Paragraph [0176] and Fig 8 of KAPUR do not find support in U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/460,222 (hereafter "Provisional Application") to which KAPUR claims priority. Appellant notes that the filing date of KAPUR are not prior art with respect to the present application and cannot be relied on in a rejection of Appellant's claim 4.

As to the argument [f], examiner disagree with the applicant because (i):prior art KAPUR filed provisional Application 60/460,222 on April 4, 2003, while instant application claiming domestic priority based on provisional application filed on 5/20/2003 which is later than the prior art KAPUR. Therefore, KAPUR is qualified as "prior art".

Further as noted in the "advisory action mailed on 11/16/2007, examiner clearly explained that Kapur discloses fig. 8 as illustrating examples of web pages provided to a client system using the functionality provided by the UDB interface system and methodologies of the present invention (section 18). Support for subject matter of fig. 8 and section 176 can be found from its provisional application (No. 60/460,222), at least on page 14, section 41 (i.e., disclosing a universal dialog box (UDB) that a user may enter various parameters depending on the functionality desired, for example, the user may enter a term or phrase in order to perform a search or enter "send mail" command in order to send an email); page 15, section 42 (i.e., disclosing a label "Amazon(argument)" in a format of command/argument is entered in the UDB, such that a search for "argument" within the amazon.com website is performed); and page 2, section 7 and page 17, section 46 (i.e., appendices A, B, and C, especially the appendix C disclosing examples of utilizing the UDB, at least on page 16, paragraph 6 (i.e., taking the user to a search results page or specific page for that particular movie by entering "eval('the movie Richard saw last weekend')" in the UDB); page 15, paragraph 6 (i.e., mapping the phrase to that web page by simply typing: "phrase:S_" in the UDB for a given phrase in some article); page 26, paragraph 4 (i.e. "w:" code for

searching weather information); and page 19, paragraphs 7-10 (i.e., thesaurus, dictionary, encyclopedia, spell-checking, white pages, etc. being utilized via the UDB). Therefore, the subject matter of fig. 8 and section 176 is supported by its provisional application.

g) At page 16, claim 4, applicant argues that KAPUR does not disclose or suggest performing a search using a predetermined term indicative of the presence of definitions.

As to the above argument [g], examiner disagrees with the applicant because Kapur specifically teaches user enters text term as a query for example “define (argument)” where argument is “quantity” accordingly dictionary definition for the argument is provided [page 17, 0176, line 18-26] that corresponds to predetermined term

Therefore, the applicants’ argument is not persuasive

h) At page 17, claim 6, applicant argues that KAPUR does not disclose or suggest performing a search including one of glossary, definition, or dictionary.

As to the above argument [h], examiner disagrees with the applicant because Kapur specifically teaches “YAHOO! REFERENCE Dictionary Definition [see fig 8], further user enters text term as a query for example “define (argument)” where

argument is "quantity" accordingly dictionary definition for the argument is provided [page 17, 0176, line 18-26] i.e., entered term identifies "dictionary definition" for the argument and accordingly provides to the user.

Therefore, the applicants' argument is not persuasive

i) At page 27-28, page 33-34, page 40, page 42, page 48, page 50-51, claim 46, claim 47, claim 49, claim 53, claim 55, claim 60, The applicant argues that Paragraph [0176], and Fig 8 of KAPUR do not find support in U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/460,222 (hereafter "Provisional Application"), to which KAPUR claims priority. Applicant notes that the filing date of KAPUR is April 5, 2004, which is after Applicant's filing date of June 27, 2003. Thus, paragraph [0176] and Fig 8 of KAPUR are not prior art with respect to the present application and cannot be relied on in a rejection of Appellant's claim 1.

Furthermore, none of the documents supplied by KAPUR as part of the Provisional Application disclosed or suggest a user interface configured to present one or more definitions for a phrase in an order determined based on ranking of documents that contain the presented one or more definitions, as recited in claim 1. In fact, none of the documents of the Provisional Application disclose or suggest definitions of phrases.

As to the argument [i], examiner disagree with the applicant because (i): prior art KAPUR filed provisional Application 60/460,222 on April 4, 2003, while instant application claiming domestic priority based on provisional application filed on

5/20/2003 which is later than the prior art KAPUR. Therefore, KAPUR is qualified as "prior art".

Further as noted in the "advisory action mailed on 11/16/2007, examiner clearly explained that Kapur discloses fig. 8 as illustrating examples of web pages provided to a client system using the functionality provided by the UDB interface system and methodologies of the present invention (section 18). Support for subject matter of fig. 8 and section 176 can be found from its provisional application (No. 60/460,222), at least on page 14, section 41 (i.e., disclosing a universal dialog box (UDB) that a user may enter various parameters depending on the functionality desired, for example, the user may enter a term or phrase in order to perform a search or enter "send mail" command in order to send an email); page 15, section 42 (i.e., disclosing a label "Amazon(argument)" in a format of command/argument is entered in the UDB, such that a search for "argument" within the amazon.com website is performed); and page 2, section 7 and page 17, section 46 (i.e., appendices A, B, and C, especially the appendix C disclosing examples of utilizing the UDB, at least on page 16, paragraph 6 (i.e., taking the user to a search results page or specific page for that particular movie by entering "eval('the movie Richard saw last weekend') in the UDB); page 15, paragraph 6 (i.e., mapping the phrase to that web page by simply typing: "phrase:S_" in the UDB for a given phrase in some article); page 26, paragraph 4 (i.e. "w:" code for searching weather information); and page 19, paragraphs 7-10 (i.e., thesaurus, dictionary, encyclopedia, spell-checking, white pages, etc. being utilized via the UDB).

Therefore, the subject matter of fig. 8 and section 176 is supported by its provisional application.

j) At page 29, claim 46, applicant argues that "In addition, neither KAPUR nor KLAVANS disclose or suggest means for determining a plurality of documents each containing at least one definition, as also recited in claim 46.

KLAVANS does not disclose or suggest means for determining a plurality of documents each containing at least one definition, as recited in claim 46.

As to the above argument [j], examiner respectfully traverses. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Kapur disclosed server element 160 receiving a query to be defined from a client element 120, page 3, 0025, fig 8, page 17, 0176, further Kapur also specifically teaches user interface or universal display box where user enters query [fig 7-8, page 17, 0176, line 1-2]. It is however, noted that Kapur does not disclose definitions from a plurality of documents, although Kapur specifically suggests user can enter a query including words and phrases using

universal dialog box [page 15, col 2, 0152]. On the other hand, Klavans teaches extracting at least one of the definitions from a plurality of documents [see abstract, page 1, col 1, 0008], i.e., Klavans specifically teaches definitions from text articles on the Internet, in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Klavans's generating dictionary entries with universal search interface system of Kapur because Klavans discloses user interface to access information [see fig 1], both Kapur, Klavans specifically teach information retrieval using internet [Kapur: fig 1-2; Klavans: page 2, col 1, 0027, line 10-12], further Kapur specifically suggests concept analysis of search terms i.e., to provide more meaning full results to the user [page 4, col 1, 0030, line 1-4] particularly search phrases; while Klavans teaches building dictionary database containing " term, definition" particularly improving on-line dictionaries [see Abstract, page 2, col 1, 0027-0029].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the search technique, particularly information retrieval using universal interface extracting term-definition pairs from full text articles and use as dictionary entries as taught in the Klavans [page 1, col 1, 0007], to improve the overall search system of Kapur for the predictable result of enabling standard searching, further providing a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

k) At page 32, claim 46, applicant argues that "Furthermore, the Examiner has not explained how Fig 8 of KAPUR might be combined with the dictionary database of <term,definition> entries of KLAVANS to allegedly provide a user interface configured to present one or more definitions for the phrase in an order determined based on ranking of the documents that contain the presented one or more definitions. KLAVANS does not disclose or suggest any user interface for presenting the dictionary entries.

As to the above argument [k], Examiner disagrees with the applicant because firstly, Kapur teaches user interface i.e., user input into universal dialog box or UDB [page 17, 0176, line 1-2], secondly, Kapur specifically teaches "YAHOO! REFERENCE Dictionary Definition [see fig 8], while KLAVANS specifically teaches extracting term-definition pairs from text articles see abstract, page 1, col 1, 0008], i.e, Klavans specifically teaches definitions from text articles on the Internet, in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary. Kapur also specifically suggests classifying and ranking web pages particularly using search related algorithms for processing and ranking web pages [page 3, col 1, 0025, line 12-17], while Klavans also specifically teaches algorithm that not only automatically generating extraction patterns which identify <term,defintion> but also rank patterns I.e. <term,definition> [see Klavans: page 4, col 2, 0053, line 6-15]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Klavans's generating dictionary entries with universal search interface system of Kapur because Klavans discloses user interface to

access information [see fig 1], both Kapur, Klavans specifically teach information retrieval using internet [Kapur: fig 1-2; Klavans: page 2, col 1, 0027, line 10-12], further Kapur specifically suggests concept analysis of search terms i.e., to provide more meaning full results to the user [page 4, col 1, 0030, line 1-4] particularly search phrases; while Klavans teaches building dictionary database containing " term, definition" particularly improving on-line dictionaries [see Abstract, page 2, col 1, 0027-0029].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the search technique, particularly information retrieval using universal interface extracting term-definition pairs from full text articles and use as dictionary entries as taught in the Klavans [page 1, col 1, 0007], to improve the overall search system of Kapur for the predictable result of enabling standard searching, further providing a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

Therefore, the applicants' argument is not persuasive.

l) At page 35, page 43, page 52, claim 47, claim 53, claim 60, applicant argues that "in addition, neither KAPUR nor KLAVANS disclose or suggest a search engine identifying a plurality of documents based on a search query including terms indicative of a presence of definitions"

KLAVANS does not disclose or suggest a search engine identifying a plurality of documents based on a search query including terms indicative of a presence of definitions"

As to the above argument [I], examiner disagree with the applicant because, firstly, Kapur is directed to interface system providing various search functions [page 1, 0002, line 4-6], secondly, Kapur clearly suggests searching on internet using major search providers for example MSN, Google [page 1, col 1, 0005, line 1-2], Yahoo [fig 8]; thirdly, Kapur also specifically suggests server system connected over internet as detailed in fig 2, page 3, col 1, 0026, line 3-6], it is noted that all these search engines allows users to query, accordingly search results returned for example web page[s], page links and like [page 3, col 2, 0029]. It is further noted that Kapur specifically teaches "crawling/spidering" web pages that containing definition/descriptive information for example as detailed in page 4, col 1, 0030, line 10-17, page 9, col 2, 0072, page 17, col 2, 0176, line 19-26]

On the other hand, KLAVANS specifically teaches extracting term-definition pairs from text articles see abstract, page 1, col 1, 0008], i.e, Klavans specifically teaches definitions from text articles on the Internet, in order to provide a more

comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary. Kapur also specifically suggests classifying and ranking web pages particularly using search related algorithms for processing and ranking web pages [page 3, col 1, 0025, line 12-17], while Klavans also teaches algorithm that not only automatically generating extraction patterns which identify <term,definition> but also rank patterns i.e. <term,definition> [see Klavans: page 4, col 2, 0053, line 6-15]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Klavans's generating dictionary entries with universal search interface system of Kapur because Klavans discloses user interface to access information [see fig 1], both Kapur, Klavans specifically teach information retrieval using internet [Kapur: fig 1-2; Klavans: page 2, col 1, 0027, line 10-12], further Kapur specifically suggests concept analysis of search terms i.e., to provide more meaning full results to the user [page 4, col 1, 0030, line 1-4] particularly search phrases; while Klavans teaches building dictionary database containing " term, definition" particularly improving on-line dictionaries [see Abstract, page 2, col 1, 0027-0029].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the search technique, particularly information retrieval using universal interface extracting term-definition pairs from full text articles and use as dictionary entries as taught in the Klavans [page 1, col 1, 0007], to improve the overall search system of Kapur for the

predictable result of enabling standard searching, further providing a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

m) At page 38, page 46, page 55, claim 47, claim 53, claim 60, applicant argues that "Furthermore, the Examiner has not explained how Fig 8 of KAPUR might be combined with the dictionary database of <term,definition> entries of KLAVANS to allegedly obtain a search front end matching a phrase for which a definitions is sought against stored information for each identified document, returning one or more matching definitions based on the matching of the phrase, and presenting each matching definition in an order determined based on a ranking of documents that contain the presented one or more definitions.

As to the above argument [m], Examiner disagrees with the applicant because firstly, Kapur teaches user interface i.e., user input into universal dialog box or UDB [page 17, 0176, line 1-2], secondly, Kapur specifically teaches "YAHOO! REFERENCE Dictionary Definition [see fig 8], while KLAVANS specifically teaches extracting term-definition pairs from text articles see abstract, page 1, col 1, 0008], i.e, Klavans specifically teaches definitions from text articles on the Internet, in order to provide a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary. Kapur also specifically suggests classifying and ranking web pages particularly using search related algorithms for processing and ranking web pages [page 3, col 1, 0025, line 12-17], while Klavans also specifically teaches algorithm that not only automatically generating extraction patterns

which identify <term,defintion> but also rank patterns I.e. <term,definition> [see Klavans: page 4, col 2, 0053, line 6-15]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Klavans's generating dictionary entries with universal search interface system of Kapur because Klavans discloses user interface to access information [see fig 1], both Kapur, Klavans specifically teach information retrieval using internet [Kapur: fig 1-2; Klavans: page 2, col 1, 0027, line 10-12], further Kapur specifically suggests concept analysis of search terms i.e., to provide more meaning full results to the user [page 4, col 1, 0030, line 1-4] particularly search phrases; while Klavans teaches building dictionary database containing " term, definition" particularly improving on-line dictionaries [see Abstract, page 2, col 1, 0027-0029].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the search technique, particularly information retrieval using universal interface extracting term-definition pairs from full text articles and use as dictionary entries as taught in the Klavans [page 1, col 1, 0007], to improve the overall search system of Kapur for the predictable result of enabling standard searching, further providing a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

Therefore, the applicants' argument is not persuasive.

Examiner applies above arguments to claims 48,52, 54,58 depend from claim 47, 53 respectively..

n) At page 39-40, page 47-49, claim 49, claim 55, applicant argues that "claim 49 recites that a search engine searches a structure of a plurality of documents for indications of a presence of a definition. KAPUR and KLAVANS, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this feature.

As to the above argument [n], as best understood by the examiner, Kapur specifically teaches use interface that allows to query, providing search result content for example as detailed in fig 2, further Kapur also suggests server element 160 is capable of web crawlers, spiders allows ranking web pages within a hierarchical structure [page 3, col 1, 0025, line 10-19], page 17, 0176, line 16-22]. It is however, noted that Kapur doesn't disclose 'extracting at least one of the definitions from a plurality of documents'. On the other hand, Klavans disclosed extracting at least one of the definitions from a plurality of documents for example definitions from articles on the internet, see abstract, page 1, 0007.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the search technique, particularly information retrieval using universal interface extracting term-definition pairs from full text articles and use as dictionary entries as taught in the Klavans [page 1, col 1, 0007], to improve the overall search system of Kapur for the predictable result of enabling standard searching, further providing a more comprehensive and complete on-line dictionary.

Art Unit: 2169

o) At page 56, claim 7,29, applicant argues that " application submits that MAUER does not remedy the deficiencies of KAPUR and KLAVANS set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, this claim is patentable over KAPUR, KLAVANS, and MAUER, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

As to the above argument [o], examiner maintains the rejection of claim 7,29 depend from claim 1 as discussed reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

p) At page 57, claims 10-12,32-34, applicant argues that LINDBLAD does not overcome the deficiencies of KAPUR and KLAVANS set forth above with respect to claim 1, 23. Therefore, , these claims are patentable over KAPUR, KLAVANS, and LINDBLAD, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, 23.

As to the above argument [p], examiner maintains the rejection of claim 10-12,32-34 depend from claim 1 as discussed reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1,23

q) At page 58-59, page 60-62, claim 50, claim 56, applicant argues that LINDBLAD does not disclose or suggest a parser parsing identified documents to identify occurrences of a phrase for which a definition is sought

As to the above argument [q], as best understood by the examiner, Lindblad is directed to processing queries for documents, more specifically, each step query identifies sections, subsections of documents and path of elements [see Abstract], Lindblad also suggests "parsing process" particularly parsing the documents [see page 3, 0042, line 7-8] corresponds to parsing identified documents, further it is noted that Lindblad also teaches relevant frequency count i.e. score for document elements as detailed in page 5, 0104, line 5-12, 0220. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Lindblad into Kapur, and Klavans because that would have allowed statistical information of the phrase for the documents.

r) At page 63, claims 18-19,40-41, Applicant argues that CODEN does not overcome the deficiencies of KAPUR and KLAVANS set forth above with respect to claim 1,23. Therefore, these claims are patentable over KAPUR, KLAVANS, and CODEN, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1,23.

As to the above argument [r], examiner maintains the rejection of claim 18-19, 40-41 depend from claim 1,23, as discussed reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1,23,

s) At page 64-65, claims 20-22,42-44,51,57, applicant argues that BEEFERMAN does not overcome the deficiencies of KAPUR and KLAVANS set forth above with

Art Unit: 2169

respect to claim 1,23,47,53 Therefore, these claims are patentable over KAPUR,KLAVANS,AND BEEFERMAN, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1,23,47,53

As to the above argument [s], examiner maintains the rejection of claim 20-22,42-44,51,57 depend from claim 1,23, 47,53 as discussed reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1,23,47,53.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Srirama Channavajjala/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166

Conferees:

/Hosain T Alam/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166

/Mohammad Ali/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169